

REMARKS

In the Action, dependent claims 9 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. By this Amendment, both of these claims have been amended, together with their respective independent claims (claims 1 and 18), in order to overcome that rejection. It is submitted that the §112 rejection should now be withdrawn.

On the merits, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,098,637 to Hendry. In addition, claims 5 and 14 were rejected under that same statutory section as being unpatentable over the '637 Hendry patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,759,479 to Gotterbauer. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11, the only two independent claims in these two groups, have been amended to include subject matter deemed to be allowable in one or more of the dependent claims. Thus, it is submitted that these prior art rejections have been traversed and that amended independent claims 1 and 11, together with claims 2, 7, 8, 16 and 17 dependent from one of them, should be allowed.

Also in the Action, claims 4, 13, 18-20, 24 and 25 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over certain claims in the Applicant's co-owned and co-pending patent application. In response, the Applicant is submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer which overcomes this double-patenting rejection. Moreover, since most of the claims in this group are dependent claims and have not been rejected over prior art, some have been rewritten in independent form including all of the subject matter of the claims from which they were dependent. In this regard, (a) new independent claim 26 combines the subject matter of originally filed claims 1

and 4, (b) new independent claim 61 combines the subject matter of originally filed claims 11 and 13, and (c) new independent claim 56 combines the subject matter of originally filed claims 18 and 24. It is submitted that in view of the Terminal Disclaimer, new claims 26, 56 and 61 should be allowed, together with the newly submitted claims which are dependent from them (claims 27-34, 57-60 and 62-66).


Finally, claims 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 22 and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, several sets of new claims have been submitted by this Amendment in accordance with this allowance. Specifically, (i) new independent claim 35 has been submitted combining the subject matter of original claims 1 and 6, (ii) new independent claim 41 has been submitted combining the subject matter of original claims 1 and 9, (iii) new independent claim 45 has been submitted combining the subject matter of original claims 1 and 10, (iv) and new independent claim 49 has been submitted combining the subject matter of original claims 18 and 22. In view of the allowance of the subject matter of claims 6, 9, 10, and 22, these new independent claims also should be allowed,

together with new claims 36-40, 42-44, 46-48 and 50-55 which are dependent from them.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the case, namely claims 1-2, 4-11 and 13-66, are in proper form and patentably distinguish from the prior art. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and passage of the application to issuance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John A. Artz', is written over a horizontal line.

John A. Artz

Registration No. 25,824

28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250

Southfield, Michigan 48034

Phone: (248) 223-9500

Fax: (248) 223-9522

Dated: October 2, 2003